COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP

MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 24, 2000

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

FACILITATOR: GERALD MUELLER

TRANSCRIBED BY: CHERYL ROMSA

CHERYL ROMSA COURT REPORTING P. O. BOX 1278 HELENA, MONTANA 59624 (406) 449-6380

ORIGINAL

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had:

FACILITATOR MUELLER: Okay, we've, we've now -We've only got 54 more minutes left, by my watch, so I
do want to, to get to Paul.

And Paul, please, you know, answer their questions from last time.

MR. PERONARD: My reputation for talking long, I guess apparently proceeds me. Actually, the -- I went away from last week with the idea that I needed to come back with an update on not just the cleanups, but a couple, three topics. And so what I've got are three things I want to update you on as far as our specific actions. And then like I said, I wanted, more as a flag for things coming up in the future -- God forbid we actually look what's coming down the pipe -- I've got five subjects, issues that are going to come up that I want to get people thinking about now instead of waiting until they're, they're upon us. Okay.

As far as the cleanups go, last time, we mentioned we have targeted two places in town for cleanup. One is the old screening plant/railroad loading station down off the Kootenai River. We're in the process of, just because nothing is ever going to go simple in this job, negotiating a, sort of a three-way agreement order -- or four-way, counting DEQ. We've sort of been partnering

on, on that one side. But working with the property owners for how we're going to schedule and do the cleanup around their business operations at the screening plant.

Right now, it looks like we're probably going to start work in May. The cleanup will involve the excavation of soil off the surface of the property, probably down to about a foot in most locations. That should actually take all the vermiculite and asbestos off the property. It will get hauled off either to a secure landfill or possibility, one of the topics, my issues coming up, might be an idea to take it back to the mine site itself. Something I'll raise for discussion here in little bit. It doesn't -- from a -- The work there doesn't really matter. It's going to go offsite and be buried somewhere.

We're working out whether they want to, more or less to try to attempt to have the buildings cleaned, whether they want them demolished, whether they want the buildings restored. They're worrying about whether they're going to come back in business after this is done or whether they're going to retire. They have to sort of work out a different agreement with W.R. Grace about their, their compensation for lost business and stuff like that.

So it's sort of a interim process. We've sat down and discussed with the property owners some ideas about how we could do the cleanup or have the cleanup done. They're coming back with us, telling us how they would like to see it done, to work around their needs and their life up there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have you got the square footage on that or, or have you pinpointed it, a rough estimate? What you call the screening plant has probably got some people baffled as to --

MR. PERONARD: Well, as it turns out, I'd even missed part of it, by the way, in the original screening. Not to say that I ever make mistakes. But there's a parcel of land up there that's owned by the Raintree Nursery. That's about 21 acres. The cleanup wouldn't involve the entire surface of that site, but a good bit of it, say -- I haven't calculated that out, but about 70, 70 percent of it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Both sides of the river?

MR. PERONARD: The cleanup on the other side of the river is probably going to be a lot more limited.

We didn't find as much over there. There's probably some areas I need to fill in gaps on sample wise that we'll sort of work out as we go. There's no need to, to put the cleanup off until we have all the data back. We

can get started.

There's an area north of the -- I'm sorry, east of where the nursery is that's actually owned by the Kootenai Development Corporation right now that was actually part of the parcel of the actual screening operations. And apparently, they had some storage piles up there. And I missed it the first time up there. So we're going to come back and resample that area again to get that, that border, how far out that goes. Again, we won't have to stop -- delay the start of the cleanup to do that, we'll just envelope that end as we're working up there.

The work is fairly basic. It's straightforward.

You know, issues that we'll have come up with this is,
you know, where we decide to actually -- This is things
I need to come back to, from a more public standpoint,
because it goes back to more than just the impact on the
partners up there now, is, how much do we take out, when
do we do this, do we have to do traffic restrictions;
you know, how we actually implement the work so we don't
have broader impacts. Frankly, I see all this as being
pretty straightforward and easy to do. I shouldn't ever
say stuff like that out loud. But it is not complicated
work, I guess in my opinion.

What we'll see out of this is we'll generate

basically a work plan for how the work is going to go.

Right now, what we're going to attempt to do is have

Grace actually hire and pay the contractors to do the

cleanup, I'll do the oversight for the work. They'll

put together a work plan before anything gets done.

I'll get that out for public review and comment,

probably bring a copy here to have you look at. It

won't be anything particularly earth-shaking. It's not

going to be a workpiece or some great reading. Just

part of being an engineer is you get to write boring

stuff. But that, that's how it will go.

And again, the time frame, probably start in May. Shouldn't take but a couple months to knock the work out.

We still have to resolve how we want to leave the property, and that's mostly going to be dependent on the wishes of the partners, how, how they want to come out of this.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that to dig in and, and put back?

MR. PERONARD: Yeah. Obviously, I've got a winter, you know, to do the restoration and get replanted. You know, that's the idea, is we're not going to scrape it off and leave it denuded. It will be a -- We'll have to bring in topsoil, we'll have to

1	replant and reconfigure the property. And basically,
2	we're going to try to put it back more or less how the
3	partners want it as opposed to, you know, a set rigid
4	standard. You know, I'll let them, you know, have a say
5	in sort of how that gets done.
6	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On the other bank
7	MS. BENEFIELD: Where are you going to get the
8	soil?
9	MR. PERONARD: I'm sorry?
10	MS. BENEFIELD: Where are you going to get the
11	soil?
12	MR. PERONARD: Don't know. Gayla, I don't know.
13	Those, those are
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) something for
15	sale.
16	FACILITATOR MUELLER: Paul, do you want to take
17	questions now or do you want to wait until, until the
18	end of your presentation to take questions?
19	MR. PERONARD: I'll just give them my Yeah,
20	maybe I ought to try to run through this and do
21	questions at the end.
22	FACILITATOR MUELLER: Okay. So let's let Paul
23	get all the way through this. He's trying to talk to
24	you about both sites. And then, then we'll open it up
25	for questions.

MR. PERONARD: Okay. The work at the export plant, I'm not -- and this is, Tony, probably why you haven't heard from me lately, I'm still waiting for the soil data. Right now, the, the fibers that we found were actually in one building out there, the old bagging area out there. The way I see that going is dropping the building and replacing it.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What I'm waiting for now, to sort of really curry the scope of the cleanup, is the soil sampling from around the building and then what we found at the ball fields. I don't have that back yet. Because obviously, we want to do all this at once, as opposed to doing a part, stopping, and coming back and doing it later. mean, again, there's not a big time crunch to, to turn this out. The one building where we found the high levels isn't crucial to the lumber operations out there. We can work around the city and the, the current tenants, the lumber mill out there. So it's a matter, really, what I'm waiting for now is the data back from the ball fields and sort of the areas around that to see, to get the full handle on the scope and the size of what we do out there.

It will follow, progress in a similar fashion to how we do the screening plants. Again, this is, you dig up with some controls to keep dust and levels down, you

have to outfit the workers for proper respiratory protection. But it's not particularly complicated work.

And that's where we are with the cleanups. We have in -- something that actually -- A couple of people have mentioned to me today, when I've been discussing the data in the past, the air data that we have back, the railroad loading station screening plants and the indoor sampling with the air, I've actually discussed this, one type of operation. When I talk about the homes we sampled in Libby and the two that we had hits in, these are actually houses in Libby, not the railroad loading plant, not the Parkers' place out there. It's a separate house in Libby.

Well, I'm waiting for, on those houses, to get the rest of the garden soil and yard data back so I can figure out where and why the fibers are coming into that particular house. With that will also come the insulation samples. That will be my segue to the sample data update. I should actually have in my hands by the first of March all this data. It's probably going to take me a week or two to digest it all, what it means in the big picture. So I'll probably be back talking mid-March, I think it's what we -- that's even what we said back in January about this. Mid-March -- God forbid I'd be consistent about anything, but mid-March,

I'll be able to discuss in a larger area the complete set of data we have from the sampling we did in December and January.

And I really want to -- before I talk about individual plots beyond the two processing centers, I want to see all of the data, to see if we can put into meaning the garden levels and the air levels we saw inside houses, to see if there's any sort of correlation. That's going to take a bit of data digestion, try that in English, data digestion to do. So mid-March is when we'll have that back and when we've talked about it.

After the senate hearings and a few other meetings,

I, I caught the message that folks think the pace of our
data analysis is slow. So I've actually added on
another laboratory to do analysis. We've, we've just
finished the procurement for that. It's not going to
help get this first batch of data done any quicker, but
the next set of sampling we do, when we start getting
into the next houses, which will be my next segue,
should actually turn around a little quicker. We, we
actually are getting better at handling and processing
these samples and getting the stuff done as we go.

The next round of sampling in houses will start

March 6. I'd hoped to start it this week or the

beginning of next week. But the labs are still backed up and, again, I don't want to -- I want to time this so I don't create log jams. And I want to get the other, the extra lab on-line. So March 6, we'll come back and do another round of ambient air sampling. We'll start back in in homes.

We're going to focus in now on two types of priorities. We've got a list of about 200 volunteers now. We're in the process now of culling out two priorities, homes of former workers and then homes that are closer to the two processing centers, i.e., closer to the old export plants. We'll really -- you want to count the one near the, the export plant that used to be down where the mill is now and then those are that closer to the screening plant. So that's MK Village and the trailer park out in that. That's not going to be all of it, but that's where we're going to focus the next round of data.

And the idea from that is we're going to try to see if we can pick up a geographic pattern moving away from these processing centers, if we can see a relationship to high levels in homes related to proximity to these different these processing locations. I don't know if we are or not, but it's one of the factors we're trying to cull out: Does that put you at more risk now, and

did it in the past, being located closer to these locations? That's, that's where that will focus in.

We mentioned before at the public meeting that we are going to do recounts, we are going to do some things with the analytical methodology to lower our detection levels. And we actually had planned to have that done by the end of February. I got faxed up the recounts today, so I'm six days ahead of schedule for once. I haven't had a chance to really go through it. First blush, it doesn't really change the results in terms of number of houses where we found fibers at the levels of concern.

Now, maybe I'll bring this up as an issue, what we are clearly seeing, and something a couple folks have brought to my attention I need to discuss better. This is -- I'm going to go ahead and segue now into -- No, I'm not, I'm going to save this. There's an issue about how we're doing the sampling analysis. And I want you all to know the methodology we're going through and how we're doing it. I'm going to put that aside for a second.

The next big thing coming on the table is the actual exposure assessment and medical screening. We are on schedule still to start that this April. It's actually going to be headed up by the Agency for Toxic Substance

and Disease Registry, ATSTR. Hope that I can say that enough that I can start saying ATSTR and folks will know what I'm talking about.

Brad and Gayla -- and I don't know if anybody else from Libby went. We actually convened a, in Cincinnati this week a sort of meeting of, I'll call them medical luminaries from around the country. There were some folks from Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, some folks from the University of Cincinnati, some different government agencies who specialize in the identification, treatment, and care of asbestos-related diseases. And what we put forth and tried to work out is sort of the first draft of the screening protocol; how we're going to test people, what kind of testing we're going to do, who we're going to make it available to.

The idea is that there's some larger issues in the medical community about how you do these studies. We wanted to get input from the smartest people we could. Believe it or not, you know, people a lot smarter than me, as opposed to me like drawing it on a napkin and just doing it.

All right, Leroy, that was, that was harsh.

But this is one of the things, by the way, when I talk about how we do the plans, that you all need an

1 input to, even if it's not, you know, strict -- You know, we'll involve the local medical community, but 2 3 it's, to me it's important that folks outside of the local hospital, outside of the medical community, outside of the government agencies see how this is 5 getting put together, see how we make decisions about 6 the number and types of sampling and testing we do. Because these are -- Again, there's not a standard way 8 to do this. We're going to develop the protocol for use 10 here and we need public input on it.

As I understand it, they came to a pretty decent consensus about how the protocol should be implemented and the types of tests that should be done.

Since I wasn't there, Brad, you can --

DR. BLACK: Yeah.

11

12

13 .

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PERONARD: -- nod at that. I haven't talked to Chris yet.

We will actually circulate that for public comment before it gets done. The, the time frame for actually getting that out for evaluations is probably the first of March, second week of March, thereabouts. People will start beginning to be getting calls around town. We're actually going to do what we're calling screeners, we're actually going to phone everybody that lives in the Libby Valley and ask, there's like 12, 15 kind of

questions about your life history in terms of did you work at the mine, do you want to come and participate, do you have any asbestos-related diseases, to try to sort of drum up interest, is that -- probably not the word I want to use, but sort of start prioritizing folks to get in, to set up schedules for medical screening.

16⁻

When the actual screening gets done, there will be a, a longer more in-depth medical survey, with the complete job histories and stuff like that, as well as a combination of chest x-rays and different pulmonary tests, the details of which will be in this evaluation that we're going to put out.

We've actually already started to acquire -- to buy the equipment to do it. No matter how you slice it up, you end up having to have x-ray equipment, different pulmonary testing equipment. So I'm in the process of buying that stuff. We're lining up space near the local hospital where we're going to put in a trailer, get it outfitted. The equipment stuff will stay locally once we're done with it. But the idea is we'll set up the space to do that. And we're, we're doing that now. It should keep us on track -- I mean, it's not a done deal. We haven't figured out exactly how all this is going to work out, but if I don't start getting the equipment and stuff lined up now, we won't be ready to start in April,

even if we do get input on it.

So you'll start getting calls in March. And there will be a, probably a big announcement asking for plans and -- comments and input on the plan itself. And the ATSTR will start doing what they call availability sections, where they'll come, available to answer questions specifically about the, about the medical screening, testing, and protocols there.

Just, again, getting back to the seamless coordinated government, if you don't feel like dealing with just another entire government agency, you can always call me or our office. We can run down the right people at ATSTR for you to talk to. That's -- Why should you all have to learn another government organization? It's been hard enough for me, we shouldn't waste that upon everybody else as well. But that's coming.

And to me, by the way, this is a pretty crucial element to our overall big picture answer for the state of Libby and what it means to live here now or lived here in the past. So it's a big element. It's very important to us that we get people out to participate in it, that we get, you know, that we actually go out and find the workers, their families, no matter where they are, that we identify a broad spectrum of the community

out here in the Libby Valley and get them in there and get them through the screening. It's a lot of information for us. I think it will provide a good medical service back to the community, at least a first start on getting some more definite answers to the basic question: How many cases are we really talking about out here in Libby? And this is, this is going to be our one shot at being able to answer that, really, first shot at it.

Okay. So that's going to be my segue to issues that are coming up.

Specific with the exposure assessment/medical screening, we've been struggling, wrestling, debating -- I wasn't going to use that word, but, but trying to figure out who we actually do in this first screening and how many. Right now, the way I, I understand it, we're probably looking at former workers and their families, everybody within, say, two and a half miles of downtown Libby, which is basically the greater Libby Valley; and then anybody else who has had what we're terming special exposure scenarios, you played in the pile as a kid, you --

What were some of the others, Brad? That's, that's the one big one, but --

DR. BLACK: Well, service workers to the mine

site, another one.

MR. PERONARD: That's right. You -- Let's say you didn't work at the mine, but you serviced the vehicles from the mine. So that's, that's sort of the exceptions. And that's some of the questions that you'll get in these screeners that people will start doing the first of March.

MS. BENEFIELD: Now, this is going to include Troy families also, though, right? That's a question that came up after all of this other --

DR. BLACK: Yeah, that's, that's how it was set up. That's why they have the open meetings also. And it's, it's a chance to get self-referral. And it will be well-publicized. Because these -- a number of people have moved to different areas and, and I think the discussion that came up in Cincinnati, and Gayla was there, so -- but basically, the idea was, and I don't know what we'll finalize on, but hopefully, the idea was that whoever can make it back that used to work at Grace or, or lived in the, in the geographic area has an opportunity to come back and participate. But I, I don't think that has been final, and that's something we may want input on or something like --

MR. PERONARD: So that, I mentioned that because that (inaudible) very question, do you exclude or

1 include the entire population of Troy? MS. BENEFIELD: Well --2 3 MR. PERONARD: The, the pros for that is you get more people in there. The cons to that is it slows down the overall collection of the information. 5 MS. BENEFIELD: Well, I think you look at the, 7 the criteria that they set up. And first (inaudible) 8 criterias, it would exclude some people because they 9 would have absolutely no relationship to the mines. 10 MR. PERONARD: And by the way, it's going to 11 exclude some people who live in Libby. 12 MS. BENEFIELD: And some people who actually 13 live here. 14 MR. PERONARD: Yes. 15 MS. BENEFIELD: But I thought that afterwards, 16 because you -- They had talked about the two-and-a-half-mile radius and then the little neck up 17 18 the river. And I totally, pardon me, John -- oh, he's 19 gone, good. Plumb forgot about Troy. 20 DR. BLACK: And that's addressed with the other, 21 the other public meetings. We'll address that in each 22 area. There's going to be one in Libby also for the 23 outlying areas outside of this geographic area. 24 There are, there are MS. BENEFIELD: Yeah. quite large group -- family groups of people living in 25

1 Troy who worked at the mine.

MR. PERONARD: Well, the working at the mine would bring them in the scope of the study. It's now --

MS. BENEFIELD: Yeah, that's what I was going to say, with the criteria.

MR. PERONARD: Now, we think this is going to be encompassing about 5, 5,000 people, which is a pretty broad screening. And so logistically, that's a couple -- you know, if you want a picture, doing x-rays and doing the interviews, that's a couple, three months' work just collecting that information. The, the balance there, if we make it available to everybody and it's 12,000 people, this is just -- it extends the study that much longer and you probably didn't gain anymore information from the study aspect. You've provided a larger medical service. But you've got to weigh the pros and cons.

The, the whole point I wanted to bring that up is, when we put this out, take a hard look at what we're proposing for the scope of the study. And if it's something you can't live with, this is something we need to hear about.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are, are loggers included in that --

MR. PERONARD: It's going to be one of the

special service work groups. And we probably need to 1 make sure that's a line item. If you've logged up in 2 3 that area, then we want to make sure that you're included in the scope, that you know you're invited to 5 come get tested. That's regardless of where you live. MS. BENEFIELD: I think pretty much anybody who 7 lived in Libby is going to be able to --MR. PERONARD: I think when it comes down there, 8 9 it's, it's about right. 10 There are some specific issues, again, there, there -- It gets into minutia almost, but there's some 11 12 debate over how we order the test. Do we order it just, 13 you know, for example, do we just do x-rays on the first 14 set of people and then do call-backs for pulmonary 15 evaluation where we see changes in the x-rays or do we 16 need to do a combination of tests first? 17 I can sit down with the six of these doctors and 18 get --19 DR. BLACK: We finalized that. 20 MR. PERONARD: -- three, three different things. 21 Did you finalize that? 22 DR. BLACK: That's been taken care of. 23 MR. PERONARD: All right. 24 DR. BLACK: You just missed it. 25 MR. PERONARD: Well, we didn't finalize it.

We're going to come up with --

DR. BLACK: We're going to -- it's going to be --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Send you the bill.

DR. BLACK: It's going to be formally put together and then it should be available next, next week, I think.

MR. PERONARD: Okay. But again, this issue over how we do the testing is something that I think the community ought to have input on, now that U.S. eggheads (inaudible) my eggheads have worked on it. The community ought to have an input about how this is done. So that's a specific question that, you know, maybe you all resolved in a broad way and it's a non-issue now. I was, I was a little worried about it. But maybe you fixed it. Maybe you decided what I wanted and therefore it's okay. All right.

Combination with the medical information, I, I alluded to it earlier. As soon as we start doing medical screening and testing, we are going to generate medical cases that are going to demand resources on local medical care infrastructure. And Gary is still down there. And this, by the way, doesn't even have to do with asbestos-related diseases necessarily. If you take 5,000 x-rays, we're going to -- heart conditions,

other medical problems are going to fall out of this just in general.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Respiratory (inaudible), too.

MR. PERONARD: Folks are going to want medical care. Where are they going to do that? How long are we going to be able to provide and who is going to provide that care? This is a big issue, not necessarily an EPA issue, local community issue that I think warrants discussion now.

When we, you know, the hospital announced they decided to take the, the first check in from W.R. Grace, I got three calls from people who were very upset about that. I got three calls from people who thought it was a very great idea. The one thing that all six callers had in mind was, well, I wish somebody would put this choice out in the public forum to debate first, to talk about what the pros and cons are or how we're going to do that.

Now, I actually think it's a good idea, myself -I'm going to offer an opinion here -- if the money is
taken without the strings attached and there's ways to
do that. It makes sense to me that Grace bear financial
responsibility for some of this testing, evaluation, and
medical care. It's not the end of the answer. And that

issue needs to be discussed publicly, in my mind. So

I'm going to bring that up. Not my issue, but something
the hospital and the local medical community is going to
have to deal with.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's part of what John had asked everybody in this room --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's in it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You bet.

MR. PERONARD: So since he left, I was trying to harp on that.

All right, I know I'm droning on here, but there's issues about how we do the sampling. One of my goals here is that when we're done with all our sampling and evaluations, that we'll be done and that there won't be lingering questions that you all are going to be asking two years from now about is it safe to be in Libby or not.

Now, this, this brings up a very fine point. When we do our testing, right now, we've targeted looking at a very specific size and shape and diameter of fiber, longer, skinnier fibers, that we're using to, to make our estimates and decisions about where the worst risks are now. There's a, a dissenting opinion in the medical community over whether shorter, fatter fibers actually cause harm or not. And again, I can -- that was

something that was discussed in Cincinnati. I don't know if that was resolved or not, Brad.

DR. BLACK: You're not going to get any help on that one.

MR. PERONARD: At some point in time, we're going to have to say, okay, this level in the air of these shorter fibers is safe or unsafe. You know, again, and where this is heading is we're going to have to make a decision about what we're going to do. Is that zero, is it, you know, .00005 fibers per cc? But at some point in time, I'm going to have to say, this is, this is what we're doing. How we get to this decision, how we do our testing is very important, then on how we decide what length of fibers and at what level we're concerned about.

It's not something that's going to fall out in this first screening as we're looking for things. But if we're ever going to answer the ultimate question, is it safe to have a house in Libby, we're going to have to have an answer to this. Because -- And apparently, I didn't make myself clear at the public meeting. In about a third of the samples we collected, air samples, in people's homes, we found these shorter, fatter fibers, okay. I'm going to say that again.

We've talked about two houses that had the fibers

the length of concern. Those are those longer, skinnier ones. All right. One of those was Chrysotile not related to the mines. We had one house that had these longer, skinnier fibers in it in Libby that's of levels of concern to us. In about a third of the samples, pretty low concentrations, especially relative to what used to be here, or at the mine, we found these shorter fibers.

Right now, a month ago, I would have told you these shorter fibers are not that big of a deal and they don't mean anything and there's no risk to them. There's a segment in the medical community who says, well, wait a second, we don't know that, we can't say that.

Before I leave, I want to have some sort of answer that you all know how we arrived to -- arrived at it, about what these shorter fibers mean. People who are interested in this subject, it means you have to learn an awful lot about asbestos sampling methodology and about why and how the (inaudible) physiology is on there. So this is a, to me, a topic that is ripe for not everybody necessarily to delve into, but, you know, for a pretty focused group to evaluate. But it's something that we're going to have to resolve one way or another before we say we're done here. And I'd rather do that up front and do it in the short term than having

this drag out for another year.

MS. BENEFIELD: Can I comment on that?

MR. PERONARD: Sure. Sure, Gayla.

MS. BENEFIELD: My, my gut feeling on that is, is -- and as I expressed in Cincinnati also, is the fact that 20 years from now, we don't want to look back and realize we made the wrong decision.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's right.

MS. BENEFIELD: I mean, that's, that's No. 1.

And nobody knows that much about tremolite and, and the effects of tremolite. They do about commercial asbestos, but not tremolite. And this is something that, that came up. And people there were, some were saying cut it off at the F5 micron and other ones were like, like Paul now, it's like -- it's a heavy decision. Because you aren't going to know the effects of leaving that, that fine micron or other fiber.

DR. BLACK: Yeah, there were -- Just for the group, there were some, there were some people there that were experts in, in risk analysis for communities. It's been a very difficult thing to define what is a safe level of asbestos in your, your air you breathe. And somewhere along the line, you know, there's, there's asbestos in everybody's air that we breathe. But the question is, is, what is in our air and what danger does

it pose to us?

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The -- I think that you're talking about issues -There's some people that are looking at some specific
ways of trying to define that, so that we, you know, and
there's some people that think -- There's one, one
person in particular who has come up with some rather
complex analyses to try to define risk with fibers, and
he really does believe that the long fibers are the big
issue, that they correlate the best with risk.

Now, right now, it looks good, but yet, not -- there was not a consensus in that group that we should go ahead and use that, use, use his criteria to, to determine that risk. So the general consensus of the group of the specialists that were there was, no, we can't go with that. What we'll have to do is, is look at it from this way, we'll have to go through the screening process first of all and see what the impacts are of that particular fiber in our community, see, see who it impacts and see -- and then we can determine some levels of the, of the potential toxicity with it in that group up to a certain point. And then we can, at that point, hopefully have, with that information, know how seriously to, to work on this, this fiber level. other words, can we diminish it to nothing? We don't And how much cleanup would it take and that sort know.

of thing.

I think those are all things we -- that Paul is going to need help on and, and I'm -- And medically, we're not going to have -- we're going to give you the best recommendations with all the experts' opinions on that and, and, and we'll, hopefully we can help him make that decision, if --

FACILITATOR MUELLER: Dennis has his hand up.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question.

DR. BLACK: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: During the screening, can you determine the difference between asbestosis, any other carcinogen, i.e., smoking, like bad DNA, or...

MR. PERONARD: You've got three types of diseases -- well, two types, and I'll break one of them into two further types. Asbestosis, the fibrosis, the thickening of the, of the -- formation of scar tissue in the lungs, is very distinct to asbestos exposure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is.

MR. PERONARD: Maybe you can get something like, similar to it from silicosis (inaudible) silicon fibers. It's not something that's happened here. It's pretty -- something you can contribute to asbestos exposure. Now, you don't know where exactly people got their exposure necessarily, again. You (inaudible) cases, people work

at breaks. Obviously, one of the -- I mean, the obvious candidate here is working at the mine or associating with the tremolite mill. But something (inaudible).

You have, lung cancers would be the second type of disease. Of these, you have a type in the pleural lining of the lungs -- you can see how well I'm doing at this, Brad, until I get it wrong -- mesothelioma, which again is very specific to asbestos exposure. It's a type of tumor you don't see generated by hardly anything else. And if you've got it, your first thought is it's asbestos exposure. Might have had something bizarre, but that's 99.99 percent of the cases, is asbestos specifically.

When you talk about tumors in general, in the lungs, it's very -- short of having a, a, an autopsy and seeing the fibers in there, it's very hard to determine what caused that tumor, unless you see other clinical signs of asbestos exposure that you can relate to it. So for a lot of tumors, it's a lot grayer. Two types, it's, it's pretty clear.

And, Ron, if you want to embellish on that -UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, I think that's very
good.

MS. BENEFIELD: Don't give up your day job, Paul.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, when are you going to start operating?

MR. PERONARD: Where is my knife? Didn't you take my knife today?

Okay. So with the sampling, in addition to this issue of fiber size, people ask me, how many houses are you going to sample? There's going to be some point in time where I'm going to say I think I've sampled enough houses to know what we need to know to talk about risks here in Libby. Some folks want me to sample every house in the valley. Well, I don't think I need to do that. But there's going to be a point where I, I say it's enough, and when I make that decision, I want folks to know how I concluded that and make sure that we've answered all the questions.

Yes.

MS. SKRAMESTAD: That's one of the questions a lot of people have been asking, the sampling on this house insulation, is: When you get through, you're going to say it is or it isn't. Is there going to be a guarantee? Are you going to give them something in writing and have it so that you can say this -- so if somebody wants to sell their house, or somebody wants to buy a house, is this going to be something you're going to do and notarize it and say, I checked this house,

that it's free, it's clear, and there is no problem?

MR. PERONARD: Depends on what we find. If every insulation sample we have has asbestos in it, then I'm going to say just the opposite. I'm going to say, hey, anybody that's got Zonolite insulation has got asbestos in their insulation. And I, you know -- Like I said, I don't have to sample 6,000 houses to figure that out. I can do that with, you know, 30, 50.

If they, they all come back clean, actually, I need -- it's pretty funny, I need more samples to prove that there's no asbestos in the insulation than I do to prove it is, statistically speaking. And that's why we'll come to a point where, gosh, do I need a hundred insulation samples to do that? And I'll do a statistical showing that here's the, you know, these hundred houses, we've got this distribution, the level is low. And, yes, I'll do enough houses that I think I could say that categorically, asbestos doesn't have it in there.

Where it's going to get more, more difficult is if we see a broad range of asbestos concentrations in the insulation. Because there's a lot of things at the mine that would tend to vary the concentration in the insulation; where they were mining it, how it was processed and handled, what size or screening it was,

and where people picked it up. That's the most difficult answer. That's the scenario where, where I'll probably talk about doing lots and lots more houses if we start seeing corresponding air levels.

This, this is why I get into -- My sample analysis plan, we've, we've got a proposed site model for how people get exposed. If I find asbestos in insulation, but I don't see air levels in people's houses that they got it in there, what I'll probably come up and say is, hey, look, you should probably treat this material as if it had it in there for remodeling purposes, maybe you want to have your house tested if you ever do remodeling or selling it, but we don't see it posing a risk in the community as the house stands.

God, that's going to be a tough subject. I'd just as soon get the data back first and then argue about what we have, instead of going through hypotheticals.

That's the most difficult situation, Norita, about how many houses we're going to have to sample.

MS. SKRAMESTAD: Yeah, because that -- You know, at one time, somebody said, you know, too, about sealing all this stuff. They questioned sealing, too, because for the simple reason if you have it in your attic, you might need your house rewired or for any other reason or you do want to remodel, but mostly -- or put in plug-ins

1 or whatever. So that stuff could still be there. this was another concern, you know, when you mentioned sealing it off.

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, these houses, in UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: the spring and fall, I mean, they settle and groan and --

MR. PERONARD: I see the analogous to, a lot of ways, to lead-base paint or to asbestos in, manufactured asbestos in other products. It's not just the issue of is it there or not. It is, is it in such a condition that it's falling out and you're breathing it in. Because you have different -- you need to do different responses for the two situations.

One is, look, don't touch the stuff, and if you do, if you do need to remodel, then you need to protect yourself or use a licensed contractor. It's a much bigger issue if it's actually getting out into the breathing zone as it sits. And a lot of that is a house-by-house determination.

FACILITATOR MUELLER: Paul, I, I thought Norita asked you a slightly different question, and that is, will EPA issue written certifications, after they've tested a house, that it's clean or not?

MR. PERONARD: Well, we'll make it -- Sure. And then we'll make a broader statement over -- you know, in two cases, we'll give a thumbs up or a thumbs down; it has asbestos in it or it doesn't. Those are two clear possible cases. It's the middle ground where you get back into a house-by-house testing. That's, I think probably going to be the most difficult to give a satisfactory answer to people. And by the way, that affects so many more people than just the community of Libby. It's not a decision that I'll be making, by the way. That's, that's a national issue. There's, you know, a million houses with this stuff in it.

FACILITATOR MUELLER: Paul, have you, have you got a lot more, because we're at a quarter to 9 now and I promised the people in the audience an opportunity for them to ask questions or make statements, and we'll honor that. And then we need to decide on the agenda for the next meeting.

MR. PERONARD: The last thing I have on my list is what we're going to do in terms of both characterizing and then do cleanup work at the mine site itself. I'll try to give a, this fall -- this fall -- this spring, a rough draft of our plan, you know, stating our plan for how we're going to try to characterize the mine. And I want folks to take a look at that. Because that's the other sort of issue that's hanging out there.

And that's it.

FACILITATOR MUELLER: Okay. Were there other questions that you folks didn't have a chance to, to ask Paul and then I'm going to get to the audience.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've got just one question.

FACILITATOR MUELLER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Paul and Dr. Black, if the, if the medical experts come back with the decision, they finally reach their consensus on the short fibers being a problem, and, Paul, your, your data shows that, you know, 50, 60 houses or 50 percent or whatever you're claiming in the houses, if somebody doesn't get their house tested and he comes back later and says, "Yeah, I've got it in my attic," and there's remediation already planned, figuring what they're going to do with these houses, those guys aren't going to be locked out of the process as far as getting cleaned up.

MR. PERONARD: If we get into the position where we need to start doing cleanups in houses, then we need to do, I mean, I say literally, a house-by-house scenario.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

DR. BLACK: And maybe you misunderstood, Don.

What I was -- what I wanted to make clear was that we're

not going to know, there's nobody that's going to come in here and tell you what fiber size, right now, that -- I've not heard anybody from our discussions in Cincinnati --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On top of the screening.

DR. BLACK: So, yeah, we need to determine the toxicity based on what we see in the screening of the community. You know, if we, if we see impacts that we didn't expect to see and, and we're concerned more about toxicity, then I can guarantee you there will be a -- you know, we'll be looking at that very significantly, I'm sure.

So, in other words, Loren, in every aspect, you know, not just one fiber size, I think we'll -- I, I can't answer that right now, but I think as, once we get to that point, that's a, that's a topic of discussion again. Isn't it? Isn't that what you said?

MR. PERONARD: That's the only reason I raised --

DR. BLACK: And we want you to know so you don't feel like there's some distrust -- you know, we want the trust to be there. I certainly do, and I think that's what Paul is trying to say. And we don't even work together, by the way. I don't know --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

DR. BLACK: A few times we've sat by each other, so...

(General discussion.)

FACILITATOR MUELLER: One more question from the committee and then I want to open it up for the audience.

Tony.

MR. BERGET: Just, well, I'll let him have the question, but you had us write down some different questions. Maybe we can just turn those in later --

FACILITATOR MUELLER: Well, that's what I was going to suggest. We're not going to get to those tonight. So if, if those of you that wrote down questions will pass them in, we will compile them and attach them to the summary so that you will all see all the questions that were passed in. And we'll, we'll focus some more next time on the questions.

Now, for the audience.

* * * * * * * * *

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF MONTANA)
ss.
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)

I, CHERYL ROMSA, Court Reporter, Notary Public in and for the County of Jefferson, State of Montana, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were transcribed into typewriting by me from a tape recording; and that the -38- pages contain a true record of the proceedings to the best of my ability, taking into consideration the quality of the tape recording.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 7th day of March 2000.

CHERYL ROMER

Court Reporter - Notary Public My Commission Expires 8/4/03